The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doris B. Trone, Coordinator
Faculty Senate Activities

FROM: Rod French
Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE: August 22, 1994

RE: **Faculty Senate Resolutions**

Please find enclosed the administration's responses to the ten resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate during its 1993-94 term.

RSF/sdo
cc: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Executive Committee

President Trachtenberg

Attachment

2121 EYE STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20052 • (202) 994-6510

Administration Response to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate

1993-94 Term

Resolution 93/1:	*A Resolution on a Mandatory Mid-Semester Academic Warning System*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Deans for implementation.**
Resolution 93/2:	*A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Men's Basketball Team*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Athletic Department.**
Resolution 93/3:	*A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Grounds Department*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Grounds and Maintenance Department.**
Resolution 93/4:	*A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of a Joint Faculty-Administration Task Force to Assess the Long-Run Comparative Advantage of the Virginia Campus (Substitute)*
Response:	**Acknowledged; awaiting report.**
Resolution 93/5:	*A Resolution on Grading Extensions*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Deans and the Registrar.**
Resolution 93/6:	*A Resolution on the Active Participation of the Faculty in University Governance (Substitute)*
Response:	**(1) Accepted with the understanding that the Faculty Code takes precedence over the ordinances or by-laws of an individual school which may be contrary to or go beyond Code.**

(2) We understand this to be a procedural rather than a substantive change in that, in the past, the consultation requirements were satisfied by meetings and now would require a written statement with opportunity provided for a formal response. This formal response not to be unreasonably delayed or withheld.

Resolution 93/7: *A Resolution to Change the Name and Scope of the Standing Committee on Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid*

Response: **Noted.**

Resolution 93/8: *A Resolution on the Faculty Senate's Support for the GWU Green Model University Task Force*

Response: **Noted.**

Resolution 93/9: *A Resolution on the Process of Handling Administrative Non-concurrences with Faculty Personnel Recommendations*

Response: **A new proposal from the Administration will be in the hands of the Executive Committee before the first meeting of the full Senate.**

Resolution 93/10: *A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Victor H. Cohn*

Response: **The Administration associates itself with the Senate in its sentiments.**

RESOLUTIONS 93-94 SESSION

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Remarks and/or Committee Referral Response of the Administration
93/1	5/6/93	A Resolution on a Mandatory Mid-Semester Academic Warning System	Adopted 5/6/93	
93/2	5/6/93	A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Men's Basketball Team	Adopted 5/6/93	
93/3	5/6/93	A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Grounds Department	Adopted 5/6/93	
93/4	12/10/93	A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of a Joint Faculty-Administrion Task Force to Assess the Long-Run Comparative Advantage of the Virginia Campus (Substitute)	Adopted 12/10/93	
93/5	1/21/94 (Cancelled)	A Resolution on Grading Extensions	Postponed to 2/11/94	The January 21st and February 11th Senate meetings were postponed due to snow and ice storms; all items of business were postponed to the February 18th meeting.
	2/11/94 (Cancelled)	Resolution 93/5 (noted above)	Postponed to 2/18/94	
	2/18/94	Resolution 93/5 (noted above)	Adopted, as amended, 2/18/94	
93/6	3/11/94	A Resolution on the Active Participation of the Faculty in University Governance (Substitute)	Adopted, as amended, 3/11/94	
93/7	4/7/94	A Resolution to Change the Name and Scope of the Standing Committee on Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid	Adopted 4/8/94	

(continued)

RESOLUTIONS 93-94 SESSION

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Remarks and/or Committee Referral Response of the Administration
93/8	4/8/94	A Resolution on the Faculty Senate's Support for the GWU Green Model University Task Force	Adopted 4/8/94	
93/9	4/8/94	A Resolution on the Process of Handling Administrative Nonconcurrences with Faculty Personnel Recommendations	Adopted, as amended 4/8/94	
93/10	4/8/94	A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Victor H. Cohn	Adopted by Acclamation 4/8/94	

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Assistant Professor Captain-Hidalgo, Co-Chair, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, Ext. 4-7078.]

A RESOLUTION ON A MANDATORY MID-SEMESTER ACADEMIC WARNING SYSTEM (93/1)

WHEREAS, a mid-semester academic warning system could enhance the University by improving students' academic progress and student retention at a time which is increasingly difficult demographically for college enrollment; and

WHEREAS, only one school, SBPM, implements a successful mandatory mid-semester academic warning system, and one college, CCGSAS, implements a mid-semester academic warning system which is not mandatory; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That all undergraduate schools shall develop and implement a mandatory mid-semester academic warning program, whereby freshmen who are doing substandard work (which may include written work below "C" or failure to attend the class) in any course are so informed midway through the course and, if at all possible, before the eighth week of the semester; and

(2) That each school and college develop guidelines for implementing the program which would include faculty and advisors taking the initiative to communicate with the students receiving warnings.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
January 1993

Adopted May 6, 1993

Resolution 93/1

JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS

MANDATORY MID-SEMESTER ACADEMIC WARNING SYSTEM

REPORT

The national decline in high school graduates coupled with a sluggish economy has led many colleges and universities to assess their students' attrition and to develop programs to increase retention rates. Being a tuition-driven University makes the retention of students at GW imperative. Declining enrollments necessitate budget cuts which impact on all facets of the University.

The literature on retention indicates that students decide within the first six weeks of their freshman year about whether or not they are planning to remain at a particular institution. Factors that enter into this decision include how well students integrate into both the academic and social communities.

Research on first semester freshmen at GW indicate that many think they are better prepared for college than they actually are. However, by the end of the semester, a majority realize they need assistance in study and test taking skills, selecting a career, improving their writing and math skills, and speaking in class. Earlier notification of poor performance may motivate students to seek the help they need.

About 11% of GW's freshmen have a QPI below 2.0 after their first year at GW. Many of them make up the 15% of the freshmen who leave the University. For those who are not doing well academically, the mid-semester warning is a first step in helping identify students who could benefit from early intervention. By talking to the student early in the semester, the student can begin to learn the tools necessary for being successful students. This can greatly increase our retention of students who are at-risk for leaving because of bad grades.

January 1993

A RESOLUTION TO COMMEND THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM (93/ 2)

WHEREAS, the George Washington University Men's Basketball team had one of its most successful seasons in its history;

WHEREAS, this success included two NCAA Tournament victories and a spot in the "Sweet Sixteen";

WHEREAS, Coach Mike Jarvis and his assistant coaches, Ed Meyers, Scott Beeten, and Mike Jarvis, II, have stressed academic excellence in accompanying athletic excellence for this team;

WHEREAS, the George Washington University Athletic Department under Athletic Director Steve Bilsky has encouraged academic excellence through the office of Academic Coordinator Sheila Hoben and her assistant, Karen Ercole; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate offers its congratulations and best wishes for the future to the student athletes, to Coach Jarvis and his assistants, to Steve Bilsky and his staff, and to Sheila Hoben and her staff.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
April 23, 1993

Adopted May 6, 1993

A RESOLUTION TO COMMEND THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY GROUNDS DEPARTMENT (93/3)

Whereas, The Grounds Maintenance Department has undertaken an effort to beautify the campus;

Whereas, The Spring growing season has arrived reflecting the effort of the Grounds Maintenance Department;

Whereas, Such efforts have produced a burst of beautiful color throughout the campus; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate offers its congratulations to Terri Warner, Manager of the Grounds Maintenance Department, and all the members of the Grounds Crew for significantly improving the appearance of the grounds and for making The George Washington University an attractive place to work and study.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
April 23, 1993

Adopted May, 1993

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Joseph Pelzman, Chair of Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee 4-7108.]

SUBSTITUTE

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION TASK FORCE INSTRUCTED TO ASSESS THE LONG-RUN COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF THE VIRGINIA CAMPUS (93/4)

WHEREAS, the efficient allocation of financial resources is an essential component of University fiscal planning; and

WHEREAS, the continued operation of the Virginia campus has academic, fiscal and personnel implications for faculty in a number of schools, divisions and departments; and for the operating budget of the University; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That a joint faculty-administration task force be established to review the existing fiscal condition of the Virginia campus, assess its long-run comparative advantage, and assess its long-run fiscal viability; and

(2) That the committee will be co-chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting and the Vice President and Treasurer. Four faculty members (one of whom shall be a teaching faculty at the Virginia campus) of the committee will be nominated by the Executive Committee for election by the Faculty Senate; the Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint two members; and the Vice President and Treasurer will appoint one member; and

(3) That this committee will report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate. A preliminary report should be prepared for the April 1994 Senate meeting, and a final report should be prepared for the April 1995 Senate meeting.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting on November 5, 1993.

Adopted December 10, 1993

see substitute

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Joseph Pelzman, Chair of Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee 4-7108.]

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION TASK FORCE INSTRUCTED TO ASSESS THE LONG-RUN COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF THE VIRGINIA CAMPUS (93/4)

WHEREAS, the efficient allocation of financial resources is an essential component of robust University fiscal planning; and

WHEREAS, the continued operation of the Virginia campus has academic, fiscal and personnel implications for faculty in a number of schools, divisions and departments; and for the operating budget of the University; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That a joint faculty-administration task force be established to review the existing fiscal condition of the Virginia campus, assess its long-run comparative advantage, explore alternative uses of the campus, and assess the long-run fiscal viability of the Campus; and

(2) That the committee will be co-chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting and the Vice President and Treasurer; four faculty members (one of whom shall be a teaching faculty at the Virginia campus) of the committee will be nominated by the Executive Committee for election by the Faculty Senate; the Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint two members and the Vice President and Treasurer will appoint one member; and

(3) That this committee will report back its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate; a preliminary report should be prepared for the April 1994 Senate meeting and a final report should be prepared for the April 1995 Senate meeting.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting on November 5, 1993.

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Diane M. Brewer, Chair of Educational Policy Committee 4-7167.]

A RESOLUTION ON GRADING EXTENSIONS (93/5)

WHEREAS, it is University policy to require all final grades be turned in within 72 hours of a final examination; and

WHEREAS, this time frame is problematic for faculty teaching large sections which are scheduled at the end of the examination period; and

WHEREAS, it is not practical to schedule all large classes at the beginning of the examination period; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

~~That faculty teaching courses with 50 or more students who have examinations scheduled during the last three days of the examination period can contact the Registrar to arrange an extension in the submission of grades.~~

That the Vice President for Academic Affairs, upon faculty request through the Office of her/his respective Dean, shall grant a reasonable time extension for submission of grades in courses with 50 or more students where the final examination is scheduled during the last three days of the examination period.

Committee on Educational Policy
November 29, 1993

Adopted, as amended, February 18, 1994

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Victor Cohn, Chair of Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee 994-2926]

SUBSTITUTE

A RESOLUTION ON THE ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF THE FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE (93/6)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code, Article IX Section A, establishes the rights and responsibilities of the faculty in the governance of the University, in the "development, revision, or elimination of curricular offerings of each department, ..." and in the "creation, consolidation, or elimination of departments, ...";

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code, Article IX Section B, requires that the faculty be provided in a timely manner with information necessary for the development of sound, well-informed recommendations regarding such matters;

WHEREAS, in the past, the faculties of some schools, departments or programs concerned have stated and brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate that they were allegedly denied participation in the decision making process leading up to the "development, revision or elimination of curricular offerings of each department, ..." or the "creation, consolidation or elimination of departments, ..." or programs; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That as the Faculty Code is clear on the issue of meaningful participation of the faculty in the governance process, that the rights of and the responsibilities of the faculty be reaffirmed; and in particular

(2) That in matters such as departmental dissolution or consolidation, curriculum revision, or faculty transfer between schools, the appropriate faculty bodies at the program, departmental and school levels and, where appropriate, the Faculty Senate be informed sufficiently in advance in order to provide for meaningful participation in the decision making process as prescribed in the Faculty Code and the ordinances and bylaws of the particular school; and

(3) That in advance of any such proposed changes the officers of administration provide the faculty with a written statement concerning proposed changes and the reasons underlying the changes, and that the faculty be afforded the opportunity to formally express their views and offer written suggestions in connection with such changes.

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee
February 14, 1994

Adopted, as amended, March 11, 1994

[A resolution from the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. For questions, call Victor Cohn, Chair 994-2926]

See Substitute Res.

A RESOLUTION ON THE ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF THE FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE (93/6)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code, Article IX Section A, establishes the rights and responsibilities of the faculty in the governance of the University, in the "development,, revision, or elimination of curricular offerings of each department, ...," and in the "creation, consolidation, and elimination of departments, ...";

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code, Article IX Section B, requires that the faculty be provided in a timely manner with information necessary for the development of sound, well-informed recommendations regarding such matters;

WHEREAS, in the past, the faculties of some schools, departments or programs concerned have stated and brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate that they were denied participation in the decision making process leading up to the " development , revision or elimination of curricular offerings of each department, ... or the "creation, consolidation and elimination of departments,..." or programs.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) As the Faculty Code is clear on the issue of meaningful participation of the faculty in the governance process, that the rights of and the responsibilities of the faculty be reaffirmed, and in particular

(2) That in matters of departmental dissolution or consolidation, curriculum revision, or faculty transfer between schools, the appropriate faculty bodies at the program, departmental and school levels and of the Faculty Senate be informed sufficiently in advance and be allowed to participate in the decision making process as prescribed in the Faculty Code, and

(3) That in advance of any such proposed changes the officers of administration provide the faculty with a written statement concerning proposed changes and the reasons underlying the changes, and that the faculty be afforded the opportunity to formally express their views and offer written suggestions in connection with such changes.

Adopted by the Committee: 14 February 1994

BACKGROUND "A RESOLUTION ON THE ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF THE FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE. "

The attached selected materials are provided to the Senate for information and background only in order to indicate through the medium of a particular instance the generic sort of misunderstandings and consequent disputes which have arisen in the past and which the accompanying resolution is designed to obviate. As you will note, the text of the proposed resolution does not address the merits of the positions taken by parties in any ongoing dispute.

The materials relate specifically to a recent partition of the Administrative Sciences Program in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, now part of the Columbian College Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (CCGSAS). This partitioning retained the Human Resources Management and Organization Management degree offerings in CCGSAS while the Management Information Systems offerings were transferred to the School of Business and Public Management.

1. Memorandum to Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom from E. J. Cherian, et al., dated November 3, 1993, plus attachments thereto.

2. Letter to V. Cohn, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom from Dean Linda B. Salamon, sated November 23, 1993, plus attachments.

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

COLUMBIAN COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

November 23, 1993

Professor Victor Cohn
Department of Pharmacology
Ross Hall 636
CAMPUS MAIL

Dear Victor:

At the conclusion of the last meeting of the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, I was asked a question the force of which I did not then, I think, understand.

The query followed my presentation of background information on the decision to move the administrative locus of a set of Management Information Systems programs from Arts and Sciences to the Management school. A regular member of the Committee noted, from the materials presented by members of the Administrative Sciences faculty, dated November 3, that the original proposal to establish the programs had been approved by the Dean's Council of the Graduate School; he asked, essentially, if I could confirm that Council approval. My answer was "Yes, as any new program would be so presented," and he expressed contentment with that response.

Given my own focus that afternoon, I had no sense of any sub-text to the inquiry. Later, I perceived that our colleague may have been tacitly asking whether the Dean's Council had considered the proposed relocation last year—that is, he was inquiring about consultation. Once again, the answer is "Yes."

In my presentation, you will recall that I handed out an outline, with dates, of the steps that led me to recommend the decision to move the MIS programs to Management. If you will consult the center column of that outline, you will find a full record of consultations; on February 10, you will see the Dean's Council discussion among all the others, a discussion recorded in the meeting notes. The Dean's Council is a "duly constituted" body, as are—in various ways—several other groups with which I spoke.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
PHILLIPS HALL 212 • WASHINGTON, DC 20052 • (202) 994-6130

The issue was a continuing one: the Administrative Sciences faculty had expressed its views extensively in a self-study and recommendation during 1991-92. Their opinions were on written record and had been thoroughly heard by Dean Kenny and Vice President French. I was not in doubt about those views, and I did not request an additional, personal oral presentation from them. Questions about Management Information Systems programs revolved around the place of MIS among Arts and Sciences disciplines, the institutional "fit" of MIS faculty in our departments, the character and interests of MIS students, and the relationship of these programs and students to those of the Management school; thus I consulted with a variety of Arts and Sciences units and groups, and those meetings are recorded.

I will be glad to supply your Committee with further information that may be useful. For now, I enclose the results of the first joint discussion on the transition as evidence of significant good faith. (This meeting, held later than desirable in large part because Professor Zeidner was out of the country, began the process of transition planning; any prior effort merely proposed an agenda.) And I repeat that no programs were closed or altered, and no faculty contracts were violated—simply, an administrative change was made in order to rationalize the effective management of programs and the coherence of their presentation to the community of potential students.

Thanks for your attention.

Sincerely,

Linda B. Salamon
Dean

Enclosures

Decision-Making Calendar: Management Information Systems
L. B. Salamon

Causal Events	Consultations	Decision Points
• mid-November, '92: F. D. Fowler reports parallel, confusing, advertisements for VA Campus Executive programs.		
• 9 December, '92: R. French, by memo, requests attention to structure for delivery of MIS programs.		
• ?? January, '93: G. Learmonth reports impossibility of filling VA Campus EMIS cohort, proposes measures that violate program's integrity. (unscheduled visit, phone calls over a week)		
• 21 January, '93: E. Cherian, J. Zeidner report lack of fit between final candidates for Psych/MIS position and MIS teaching needs.		
--Throughout December and January, LBS reads files of reports, etc., consults Associate Deans, reflects--		
	• 2 February, '93: Discussion with R. Smythe, R. Goldfarb, J. Lebowitz (Ad Sci program-review committee) concerning their impressions, reflections, reasons for recommendations.	
	• 3 February, '93: Meeting with J. Zeidner concerning FY '94 budget, staffing, implications, etc.	
	• 10 February, '93: Meeting with CCGS Dean's Council to discuss feasibility, acceptability of alternative administrative structures.	

Causal Events	Consultations	Decision Points
	• 12 February, '93: Meeting with F. D. Fowler, E. Winslow, J. Carson concerning relations between MIS programs, potential 'fit' and economies.	
	• 16 February, '93: Meeting with D. Silber, R. Caplan, C. E. Rice, C. Rivera to discuss relations between Organizational Behavior programs, potential 'fit' and economies.	
		• c. 18 February, '93: LBS reaches tentative conclusion on direction for change.
	• 19 February, '93: Meeting with J. Ziedner to discuss staffing with 1 sabbatical, 2 departures, change in lab administration, gaps in MIS. INCLUDED: direction of LBS thinking, potential for administrative change.	
	--Pause in decision-making process: Dean Fowler out of country-- (During this period, J. Zeidner and E. Cherian meet with R. French)	
• 22 March, '93: G. Learmonth reports disagreements between VA Campus Executive programs concerning recruiting events, etc.		
		• 29 March, '93: F. D. Fowler, LBS reach conclusion on administrative change, consequences, and timing.
	• 9 April, '93: F. D. Fowler, LBS meet with R. French to report conclusions, make plans. LEADS TO FORMAL MEMO OF AGREEMENT ON CHANGE, 12 April.	

Causal Events	Consultations	Decision Points
	• 12 April, '93: F. D. Fowler, LBS discuss financila, management implications for VA Campus with I. Price, E. Jones.	
	• 15 April, '93: F. D. Fowler, LBS meet with J. Zeidner, E. Cherian, G. Learmouth, E. Winslow to begin laying out conditions for administrative change, planning transition.	
	• 21 April, '93: Meeting with J. Zeidner to discuss development, alternatives, implications. LEADS TO CHANGE →	• 21 April, '93: LBS agrees to maintain OM, HR programs with Ad Sci as an independent entity, at least until Zeidner's retirement.
	• 26 April, '93: Meeting with regular Ad Sci faculty (at LBS request) to report changes and consequences, including development of OM, HR.	
	•27 April, '93: Meeting with J. Zeidner to discuss negotiations with candidate selected for Psych/Ad Sci position--business as usual.	

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

July 21, 1993

TO: David Fowler
Dean, School of Business and Public Management
For transmission to: J. Carson, J. Coyne, F. Winslow

David Rowley
Assistant Dean, CCGSAS

Joseph Zeidner
Chair, Administrative Sciences Program
For transmission to: E. Cherian, G. Learmonth, W. Money

FROM: Linda B. Salamon LBS
Dean

My apologies for the delay in presenting notes from our July 13 meeting. Professor Zeidner's memo—prepared with admirable speed, for which we are all grateful—arrived literally as I was leaving town, and I wanted to incorporate the Ad Sci faculty's points into a consolidated document. I worked on the first-round agenda literally on the plane, but rural France does not offer FAX on weekends, and I went too late on Monday. *Encore, voila!*

A few comments on the Ziedner memo: Its focus on offerings to students and the quality of their experience is correct, but we must be flexible about course-change (as opposed to "*major* change") and about part-time faculty, so long as quality is assured. "Ownership" of the Crystal City computer lab will continue to be imprecise; DUR (formerly DCE) should continue its level of maintenance and support, but supervision should run from Cherian through Winslow/Carson to Fowler. As Dean of the Graduate School, I cannot accept new MIS applications to CCGS after September 30; the deadline for GRE registration is long before and, with two months' notice, any *pending* applications can be completed. (Any "on the fence" may apply by then and subsequently withdraw if they cannot receive funding—I will authorize return of their $25.) New inquirers from now on should be recruited to the new arrangement.

I will be in Washington all of August 2 and 3 and on the morning of August 4, should a large-transition-team meeting seem useful. From August 12 on, given other calls on my time, I am regularly available. The first task, I expect, will be to prioritize the order for discussion of items on the agenda.

Attachment

TRANSITION-PLAN AGENDA: MIS Programs' Transfer from Arts and Sciences to Management School

I. Immediate Issues

Staffing

- designate instructors for FA 93 courses, including common core shared with HR/OM (most, selected)
- fill two positions, now open
  - MIS faculty
  - Crystal City lab administrator
- request revised contract letters for Cherian, Learmonth, and Money from Vice President French
- begin planning for course-instructors for SP 94, not yet designated (current adjuncts should be continued, if successful, wherever economically reasonable, after July '94, some circumstances may change)

Student Recruitment

- decide on posture for July 29, subsequent briefings
- Tell DUP of plans; stop its announcements until communications plan (below) is designed
- reach conclusion on future requirement of GRE (offered October 10) *v.s.* GMAT or other, and on other prerequisites for applicants after September 30

II. Year-long agenda

Staffing

- define, write job-description for new position of Administrative Coordinator for *all* MIS programs
- organize procedures for best grouping faculty—including in core courses shared with Arts and Sciences—over three following years
- decide on/refine administrative staff structure
  - Crystal City
  - Virginia campus (currently director/marketer, lab administrator, secretary) in relation to Management School programs
- plan for faculty advisors to students, share necessary information with all relevant staff
- discuss contract-*v.s.*-tenure track status for faculty, long-term

Curriculum

- conduct detailed review of *all* MIS curricula, with a view to:
  - course-overlap, with potential mergers to be affected (if necessary, restructure of syllabi to assure all students have *genuinely* prerequisite knowledge)
  - availability of Management faculty to teach all/part of former Ad Sci courses (e.g., Strategic Management), *vice versa* (e.g., Organizational Psych)
  - possibility of multiple "tracks" within one integrated MIS program, offered at different sites
  - future of IRM, GAO certificate programs
- plan for preparing and grading of Ad Sci students' comprehensive exams
- plan for students' course-evaluations, in common if possible
- discuss appropriate degree of integration with Management's MIS programs for medium- and long-term
- focus on examining, potentially changing prerequisites in *all* programs
- scan the future:
  - assess potential audience needs to be met
  - project the best possible programs to meet market forces
  - consider new directions, in light of emerging developments in MI

Management

- construct (from scratch) an appropriate "org chart" for all MI programs in the Management School, clarifying reporting lines
  - at Crystal City
  - at Virginia Campus, with particular attention to EMIS's relation to the Management School *and* Price's office
- clarify governance procedures for program directors
  - direct supervision
  - access to department chair
  - participation in the departmental executive committee
  - collaboration with operations, developmental coordinator

Communications

- draft, refine announcements of administrative change
  - (CCGS) to current students, describing time-limits, continuity of curriculum and advising, reasonable expectations
  - (SBPM) to adjunct faculty
  - (joint) to general audience including GW
- plan common recruitment materials for use beginning October 1
  - brochures for inquirers
  - inserts, eventually new forms, for applicants to MIS programs within Management School
  - new, forward-looking materials for general market
- work on total marketing program, including common advertising

Finances

- incorporate Arts and Sciences contributions into Management Science budget, including GTAs
- arrange transfer of Ad Sci's Virginia Campus budget (including new reserve accounts for research funding, Decision Science lab receipts)
- arrange shared budgeting of faculty in core courses with CCGS
- plan entrepreneurial investments to enhance revenue through new programs, including certificates

Space for medium-, long-term

- consolidation of Foggy Bottom offices
- common planning at Virginia Campus, including Decision Science lab
- needs at Crystal City: expanded and contiguous classroom and lab space, improved computer lab facilities

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

COLUMBIAN COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

MEMO

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

FROM: Edward J. Cherian, Nancy M. Dixon, Gerard P. Learmonth, Anne W. Martin, Joseph Zeidner

RE: Summary materials in Support of the Proposed Resolution on the Division of the Administrative Sciences Program

DATE: November 3, 1993

The purpose of this memo is to provide, for your convenience, an executive summary related to the proposed resolution under consideration by your committee. The complete documentation of the complaint that suggested the need for this resolution was given to Dr. Cohn and is, of course, available to you.

Key points of the dispute related to your consideration of the proposed resolution include:

- There never has been a formal review of the proposed reorganization and transfer of the M.S. degree programs in MIS of the Administrative Sciences Program.
- There never has been a duly constituted faculty group representing CCGSAS and/or SBPM faculties authorized to consider this matter.
- There never has been any rationale or formal documentation prepared to support the division and transfer of the MIS programs.
- This action was planned and conducted in a secretive, non-collegial manner.
- This episode has brought great distress to the faculty involved and in particular to the three faculty members who were transferred from one school to another--retroactively and without consultation.
- While the Faculty Code is perfectly clear on the issue of collective governance, the officers of administration did not adhere to the Code in this significant instance. The Faculty Code needs to be reaffirmed and mechanisms developed to insure compliance.
- The proposed resolution is necessary and entirely separate from any grievance procedure originating from the Administrative Sciences faculty.

ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES PROGRAM
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
2136 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W. • SUITE 301 • WASHINGTON, DC 20052 • (202) 676-8669

The following summary reference materials are enclosed:

- A revised copy of the resolution and brief summary (Enclosure 1).
- An executive summary or annotated "chronology" related to the reorganization and transfer of the M.S. degree programs in Management Information Systems (Enclosure 2).
- Key letters: the original complaint of the Administrative Sciences faculty to Dr. French; Dr. French's assessment of the results of the work of the "Overlap/Duplication Committee" on MIS; an unsolicited letter from 19 part-time Administrative Sciences faculty to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate; and letters from members of the Administrative Sciences faculty indicating their personal despair at the impending transfer (Enclosure 3).

Committee members:

Victor Cohn
Kurt Darr
Joseph Gastwirth
Jeffrey Henig
Carol Hoare
Walter Kahn
Harold Liebowitz
John Lobuts
Mary McGrath
Michael Moses
Howard Pierpont
David Robinson
Jeffrey Stephanic
Harry Yeide

enclosures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DOCUMENTS RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES GRIEVANCE

5/29/91 **Memorandum--VP French to Deans Burdetsky, Gross, and Kenny (cc'd to Associate Vice President Wolfman only)**

Prepares to set up committee of three faculty, one appointed by each of the addressees and chaired by Professor Wolfman, to "conduct a review of what we are presently doing in this field of information systems and what we foresee in the next three or four years." Sets forth three conditions under which course duplication can be considered benign: 1) Students differing in prior education and/or proficiency levels who might "gravitate toward and want a degree from the business versus the engineering versus an arts & sciences school; 2) Professional cultures representing differentiated markets (employers wanting to "hire people with a specific mix of courses that would be identifiably different" in the three schools; 3) Total curriculum that differs sufficiently, even while including some overlapping courses; and 4) Resources--whether enrollments are sufficient for similar courses within each of the three schools (with the possibility of cross-listing similar courses to save resources otherwise).

8/26/91 **Memorandum--Administrative Sciences Review Committee (Professors Lebovic, Goldfarb, and Smythe) to Dean Kenny and Professor Zeidner**

Gives report of the review committee for the Administrative Sciences Program, with positive conclusions about Administrative Sciences academic standards, program viability, and deservingness of continuation. Concludes that "Administrative Sciences provides a masters-level program that is significantly different from analogous offerings in other schools" and "fills a niche by serving students without a math/engineering or a programming background and by emphasizing organizational behavior..." Stresses the importance of continuing to house Administrative Sciences within GSAS, noting that "A transfer to SBPM or SEAS runs the risk that Administrative Sciences will be viewed as a relatively low priority addition whose faculty slots and assets could be better used to enhance other programs. Such an attitude would virtually ensure the program's decline." Recommends that Administrative Sciences be granted tenurable positions and department status but does not support the creation of a doctoral program "at this time."

6/2/92 **Memorandum--Professors Carson, Cherian, Harrald, Rotenstreich, Winslow, and Wolfman (ad hoc committee of faculty from Administrative Sciences, SEAS Computer Sciences, Engineering Management Information Management, and Management Science responding to VP French's 5/29/91 memorandum) to VP French and Deans Burdetsky, Gilmore, and Kenny**

Describes Administrative Sciences, Computer Science, Engineering Management, and Management Science programs in terms of students, professional culture, total curriculum, resources, and future plans. Notes that "All three programs are stretched to faculty capacity with the three course load, advising and other professional demands." Concludes "students served by the three schools are primarily in different market areas" and that it is believed "...that the students and their employers view the programs as distinctive from one another." Also concludes that course overlap and duplication amounts at most to a total of six courses, and that "[t]here are areas of

Enclosure 2

cooperative endeavors that can be more fully pursued, including joint appointments, cross-listing of courses where possible, cooperative research efforts, and the joint use of facilities."

6/9/92 **Memorandum--VP French to Deans Burdetsky, Gilmore and Kenny and Deans Designate Fowler, Frieder and Salamon**

Forwards "superb report from a committee of faculty consisting of Professors Carson, Cherian, Harrald, Rotenstreich and Winslow and chaired by Associate Vice President Wolfman." Supports recommendations of that committee regarding marketing, coordination, cross-listing and policy revisions, and review of resource allocations. Also supports acting on "preliminary identification of course duplication to eliminate it, and to take whatever steps may be appropriate and far more cross listing of courses when that is the rational thing to do." States that VP French "...accept[s] as valid the determination that our differentiated programs are justified because they do have a marketing advantage in that they speak to different potential student constituencies and that they serve those students well by preparing them for differentiated niches in the private and public sectors." Commends committee "who produced this splendid piece of work" and promises "that the administration will not allow this to become merely another archival document."

12/9/92 **Memorandum--VP French to Deans Fowler, Frieder, and Salamon**

Says "the question of duplication and/or overlap between and among programs offered by certain sections of the Department of Management Sciences and the Department of Engineering Management and the Program in Administrative Sciences has not received a final answer" although VP French previously consented to allowing the present arrangement to stay in place. Asks deans to consider whether they want VP French to ask them to "reopen the whole topic once again."

3/29/93 **Memorandum--Dean Fowler to Dean Salamon**

Thanks Dean Salamon for giving him an update about the status of the Administrative Science Program; urges conclusion of discussions on a transition as soon as possible ("Delay will foster more misunderstandings.") Summarizes issues: SBPM pleased to integrate Administrative Sciences into SBPM; transfer should be effective July 1, 1993; believes "...current offerings can be enhanced by combining them with SBPM initiatives"; commits to "...make every effort to enhance revenues and control expenses at Crystal City" and "...to support the current programs at the Virginia Campus for the fall" as well as to "...work with the faculty to establish an effective transition."

4/12/93 **Memorandum--VP French to Deans Salamon and Fowler**

Addresses " "organizational disposition of the Master of Science in the field of Management Information Systems" referring to a meeting 4/9 and Dean Fowler's memorandum of 3/29. Documents agreement among VP French and Deans Salamon and Fowler "...that contingent upon the development of a transition plan for [VP French's] approval, the 1993-94 academic year will be the transition year for this MIS program and its associated faculty and students. [Deans Salamon and Fowler]

will develop in consultation with the appropriate faculty leadership a plan for the transition of this curriculum and its faculty and students from CCGSAS into the Management Sciences Department of SBPM." Specifies that "...the 'management and budget' transition can take effect as of July 1st, but other aspects of the transition will follow in due course at times most appropriate and responsible for all parties" and that "...Dean Salamon will transfer four faculty salary lines to SBPM as part of the first step in this movement." Concludes with VP French looking forward to seeing the transition plan.

4/19/93 **Memorandum--Professor Murphree (Chair, Engineering Management) to Dean Frieder**

Forwards a proposal for and discussion of integrating the Administrative Sciences Program with the Department of Engineering Management, noting that Administrative Sciences faculty would "...prefer to come to the Department of Engineering Management rather than to the school of business. There is simply a better 'fit' and we offer them a greater opportunity to retain an identity and avoid total absorption."

4/29/93 **Letter--Administrative Sciences Fulltime Faculty (Campbell, Cherian, Dixon, Learmonth, Martin, Money, and Zeidner) to VP French**

Communicates "...dismay and disappointment in the process [VP French], Dean Salamon and Dean Fowler employed in deciding to sever the MIS portion of the Administrative Sciences Program" and informs that senders "...intend to obtain the counsel of the Faculty Senate to determine if our rights, privileges and responsibilities as members of the faculty as detailed in the *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Handbook* have been substantially breached." Notes that "While apparently considerable effort was expended to keep your enquiries secret from our faculty, the faculty of the Management Science Department was consulted and kept closely informed" and that "The faculty of the Engineering Management Department also knew of the enquiry..." Also notes that Administrative Sciences faculty "...had no firm idea of the decisions being made until a day after your letter of April 12, 1993..." and that Administrative Sciences faculty "...still do not know the basis of the decision, even after our faculty had a long meeting with Dean Salamon on April 26, 1993 and directly asked her this question." Refers to 8/26/91 report of Review Committee and quotes VP French as having said after this report that "...the matter was 'laid to rest until the next self-study review', or not before 1996." Also references VP French's memoranda of 5/29/91 and 6/9/92 establishing and accepting the report of the ad hoc committee on overlap and duplication. Notes Dean Salamon's recent assertions "...that, 'no decision has been made', and that if and when a decision for change was reached, it would not be implemented before July 1994." Communicates faculty's beliefs, based on VP French's own criteria, "...that the decision to move the MIS Program out of Administrative Sciences is in error" and that "...enrollments will be significantly diminished and eventually the entire program will be eroded..." Notes strong feeling that "...the process by which the decision was reached violates the most fundamental aspects of collegiality and consultation that are so valued in the academic community and at The George Washington University in particular." Requests meeting with VP French to "...understand why you felt compelled to bring about this change at this time after we have so recently been 'validated'...and why you so completely excluded us collectively as faculty and as individuals from your deliberations."

5/3/93 **Memorandum--VP French to Professors Campbell, Cherian, Dixon, Learmonth, Martin, Money, and Zeidner**

Expresses "...regret that the way matters have unfolded has caused you individually and collectively so much distress." Also expresses "...every intention of acting on the basis of a transition plan developed in consultation with the appropriate faculty." Promises "...that a meeting will be set up as soon as is feasible."

5/4/93 **Letter--Administrative Sciences Fulltime Faculty to Professor Lilien Robinson**

Submits grievance for review by Executive Committee of Faculty Senate, "....based on the total failure of Vice President Roderick S. French, Dean Linda B. Salamon and Dean David Fowler to follow the procedures outlined in the Faculty Code, Section IX, *Faculty Role in University Decision Making* in their recent decision to move the Administrative Sciences MIS programs to the Management Sciences Department in the School of Business and Public Management (SBPM)." Notes that the "...'secret' process and decision disregards..." both the 1991 review and self-study recommendations accepted by VP French and also the "overlap" review commissioned by him. Requests "...that the Executive Committee take action to: 1) rescind the plan to transfer the MIS Program; and 2) defer any further review and decision-making about this restructuring issue until the next self-study review, or at the earliest 1996, unless there is a compelling academic or financial reason to do so earlier." Further requests that the Executive Committee review the administration's decision process.

5/18/93 **Memorandum--Adjunct Faculty for the Administrative Sciences Program to Executive Committee of the George Washington University Faculty Senate**

Expresses disturbance regarding "...actions that recently have been taken to dismember the Administrative Sciences Program..." Urges the University "for the good of the students in this program, as well as future students, to reverse the decision and to maintain the full integrity of the Administrative Sciences Program." Gives a number of reasons for keeping the program intact and notes that "It is ironic that the Administrative Sciences Program--which teaches such concepts as total quality management, group decision making, worker participation, team approaches, etc., is being hurt by 'nineteenth century management' approaches at their worst." Also notes that "It would be one thing if the entire Administrative Sciences Program was being terminated for academic or financial reasons. But this is not what is contemplated. Instead, other parts of the University have targeted the most financially successful parts of the Administrative Sciences Program...and have left the smaller parts to struggle on their own."

6/11/93 **Letter--VP French to Adjunct Faculty, Administrative Sciences Program**

Expresses disappointment "...that you drew the conclusion that the Deans and I were indifferent to the opinions of the faculty." Says that VP French "...trust[s] that [the Adjunct Faculty] will give the administration the benefit of the doubt and assume that our actions will be guided by what we believe to be sound in the present and to hold the most potential for the future."

6/23/93 **Memorandum--Professor Zeidner to Administrative Sciences Adjunct Faculty**

Notes that "As of June 23 Dr. French has not gotten back to us about how the university intends to proceed. I plan to meet with you and let you know about developments as early as possible."

6/29/93 **Memorandum--VP French to Professor Zeidner**

Says that VP French has "concluded that the decision contained in my memorandum of April 12th addressed to Deans Salamon and Fowler should stand" and that "In response to my request in that memorandum for a transition plan, Dean Fowler and a faculty group in Management Science have drafted a recommended transition plan which is ready for our consideration. Dean Salamon is drafting a memorandum to Dean Fowler which summarizes all of the administrative details entailed by the transfer."

Addresses "...my apparent fickleness of judgment in reversing my position of a year ago" and "consultation with you and your faculty." Contains a "...calendar of [Dean Salamon's] decision-process", beginning November 1992. In this calendar, the first interaction of Dean Salamon with any member of the Administrative Sciences faculty regarding the issue of transferring MIS appears February 19, 1993--"...Dean Salamon informed [Professor Zeidner] of the conclusion of her thinking and the direction she intended to recommend." This appears after references to meetings with the Dean's Council, SBPM faculty members, and representatives with the Psychology Department related to the same issue.

Notes that VP French has "...in hand a document that represents a transition plan developed in consultation with the faculty on the receiving side...[and]...would now expect a counterpart plan from Dean Salamon that will reflect conversations with [Professor Zeidner] and the three faculty who are to be transferred." Also notes that VP French knows "that Dean Salamon has a draft plan which she will go over with [Professor Zeidner] as soon as she receives this communication."

7/1/93 **Letter--Professor Zeidner to VP French**

Acknowledges VP French's 6/29 memorandum; notes that contrary to 4/15 statements of Deans Salamon and Fowler, "Apparently there is now a transition plan(s) in hand that has been developed without any input whatsoever from the Administrative Sciences faculty." Further notes that "To us, this continues to portray the lack of collegiality, consultation and openness that has characterized this decision process from its start, and is at the core of our complaint of the exclusionary nature of the process employed."

7/1/93 **Letter--Professors Campbell, Cherian, Dixon, Learmonth, Martin and Zeidner to Professor Robinson**

Based on the administration's response to date, "...request[s] that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate prepare our grievance for the next appropriate phase."

7/2/93 **Letter--Professor Learmonth to VP French**

Describes assumptions under which Professor Learmonth accepted his appointment as Academic Director of the Administrative Sciences Program, Virginia Campus and Associate Professor of Administrative Sciences. Requests that VP French: "a) share with me your general views on this matter of the transfer of my appointment to the School of Business and Public Management; b) cite if you will any precedents of such unilateral action; c) explain why the Faculty Code provisions requiring consultation (Article IX) apparently do not apply here; and d) explain why such a transfer does not constitute a 'Termination of Non-Tenured Appointments' (Article V, Section B) requiring proper notification; and e) whether or not the appropriate faculty, department chair, and dean of the School of Business and Public Management have taken any action to offer me an equivalent appointment."

7/6/93 **Letter--Professor Money to VP French**

States that Professor Money has withdrawn from the grievance, even though he "believe[s] that the members of the Administrative Sciences faculty have a legitimate complaint that has significant merit behind it."

7/6/93 **Memorandum--VP French to Deans Salamon and Fowler**

Requests that Deans Salamon and Fowler "initiate discussions with all appropriate parties in order to begin at once the implementation of our decision to transfer the Master of Science Program in Management Information Systems to SBPM.

7/7/93 **Memorandum--Professor Robinson to Professor Rashid**

Thanks Professor Rashid for agreeing to serve as mediator; forwards Faculty Code and "all communications and materials, received to date pertaining to this case."

7/8/93 **Memorandum--Professor Robinson to Professors Campbell, Cherian, Dixon, Learmonth, Martin and Zeidner**

Notifies Administrative Sciences faculty members that Professor Rashid has been appointed Special Mediator by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Undated **Transition Plan Recommendation--Professors Winslow, Carson and Coyne to Dean Fowler**

Briefly describes "The agreements made between Dean Linda Salamon, Dean F. David Fowler, and Vice President for Academic Affairs Rod French..." further designating these agreements as "...the broad goals and objectives as agreed to by Deans Fowler and Salamon." Gives a brief "..modified timeline for the transition" specifying 7 /1/93 as the date for beginning staffing of MIS courses, for budget transition, and for beginning development of an organizational structure (which structure is also described in the 'timeline'). Also specifies that "During the academic year 1993-94 the programs will be reviewed intensively to determine developmental needs, market opportunities, academic requirements, transitional issues necessary to

bring all programs into conformity with the School of Business and Public Management mission and culture." Specifies that "Professors Carson and Coyne will have the responsibility to insure the transition and integration of the programs is as smooth and collegial as possible." Presents an organizational chart showing Professors Learmonth and Cherian reporting to Professors Carson and Coyne, who in turn report to the Chair, Management Science Department, who reports to the Dean SBPM.

7/15/93 **Memorandum--Professors Cherian, Learmonth, Money and Zeidner to VP French, Deans Salamon, Fowler and Rowley, and Professors Winslow, Carson and Coyne**

Responds to the transition plan recommendation and the events of the"... first meeting of the transition committee on July 13, 1993". Describes short- and intermediate-term concerns related to "...continuing the academic program for some 100 degree students..." and issues associated with the transition of the AdSc MIS program to SPBM. States that "The joint development of a transition plan reflecting resolution of these issues is the first step in the transition of the MIS program into SBPM. Professors Cherian and Learmonth are prepared to meet with Professor Carson and Coyne as quickly and often as is required to prepare a transition plan." Quotes from VP French's 4/12 memorandum to Deans Salamon and Fowler: "We have agreed among the three of us that contingent upon the development of a transition plan for my approval, the 1993-94 academic year will be the transition year for this MIS program and its associated faculty and students. The two of you will develop in consultation with the appropriate faculty leadership a plan for the transition...from CCGSAS into the Management Sciences Department of SBPM." Also says "In accordance with VP French's directive, we believe that specific implementation actions should await the approval of a comprehensive transition plan."

7/21/93 **Memorandum--Dean Salamon to Deans Fowler and Rowley and Professor Zeidner**

Briefly comments on Professor Zeidner's 7/15 memorandum and presents notes from 7/13 meeting as a Transition Plan Agenda.

Undated **Letter--Professor Winslow to Professor Cherian**

Announces that "...the Information Systems component of the Administrative Science Department of the Northern Virginia campus and the Crystal City Campus are being merged to be run administratively by the Department of Management Science of the School of Business and Public Management. This merger will be effective August of the academic year 1993 - 1994. Invites to "...an information sharing reception" August 26 at which"The Chairman of the Management Science Department, Erik K. Winslow, the Director of the Executive Master in Information Systems at Virginia Campus, Gerard P. Learmonth, the Director of the Management Information Systems program at Crystal City, Edward J. Cherian, and the Dean of the School of Business and Public Management, F. David Fowler, will be present to discuss the merger and what changes can be expected in the future."

8/27/93 **Letter--Professors Cherian, Learmonth, Martin, Dixon and Zeidner to VP French**

Notes intention to continue with formal grievance process. Expresses concern about "changes now being introduced...into all facets of the Administrative Sciences Program." Notes that "...we are concerned about the fact that this faculty has not been asked to participate in the planning and writing of a transition plan. On July 13, 1993 we were presented with an undated copy of a four page 'Transition Plan Recommendation'...prepared by the faculty of the Management Science Department." References 7/15 and 7/21 memoranda and also notes that "To the best of our knowledge, the issues we have raised have not been resolved and no approved plan for the transition of the MIS program into SBPM has been developed as of this date." Opines that "...partial steps are both risky and inconsistent with your request for a transition plan to be prepared in consultation with the appropriate faculty for your approval prior to implementation of this proposed change." Urges that VP French "...seriously consider our recommendation that the Administrative Sciences Program should be continued as is for the 1993 - 94 school year, as originally advocated by you, during which sufficient time should be available for contingency planning pending the outcome of the grievance process."

8/30/93 **Memorandum--VP French to Professors Zeidner, Cherian, Dixon, Learmonth and Martin**

Expresses surprise "to hear that the appropriate members of your group have not been party to the refinement and amplification of earlier draft transition plans." Describes transition steps taken by VP French, including preparation of revised appointment letters for affected faculty. Notes that Dean Salamon has "informed me that a meeting is already scheduled in which everyone is to work further on the transition plan which she expects to be finished in the very near future." Also notes VP French's attempt "to balance what I see as responsible on my part, given my assumption that the transfer will take place, with my commitment to you that everything remains contingent on the presentation by Deans Fowler and Salamon of a full-blown transition plan for my approval."

8/31/93 **Memorandum--Professors Cherian, Dixon, Learmonth, Martin and Zeidner to VP French**

Notes that the AdSc faculty members "take strong exception to the implementing actions that are now taking place, including the transfer of MIS faculty members without individual consultations, meeting with Administrative Sciences part-time faculty now teaching courses in the other tracks of our program and appointment by the Management Science Department of an instructor to teach an Administrative Sciences course without prior consultation." Expresses surprise and distress at learning "of the existence of 'earlier draft transition plans' developed without our participation, none of which we know about or have seen." Notes inconsistency of steps taken with VP French's commitment to wait for an approved plan.

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

COLUMBIAN COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

April 29, 1993

Roderick S. French
Vice President for Academic Affairs
813 Rice Hall
George Washington University

Dear Dr. French:

The purpose of this letter is to convey our deep sense of dismay and disappointment in the process you, Dean Salamon and Dean Fowler employed in deciding to sever the MIS portion of the Administrative Sciences Program, and to inform you that we intend to obtain the counsel of the Faculty Senate to determine if our rights, privileges and responsibilities as members of the faculty as detailed in the *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Handbook* have been substantially breached.

We have learned that you have again been looking into the possibility of restructuring our program since at least as early as December 9, 1992 (see enclosure 1). While apparently considerable effort was expended to keep your enquiries secret from our faculty, the faculty of the Management Science Department was consulted and kept closely informed. The faculty of the Engineering Management Department also knew of the enquiry and shared their concern with us. We, the most affected faculty, believe that by not consulting us in these deliberations you must consider us "throw-away" people. Indeed we had no firm idea of the decisions being made until a day after your letter of April 12, 1993 (see enclosure 2), although there were clear indications from other faculty that the decision concerning the displacement of the Management Information Systems Program had been made much earlier. We still do not know the basis of the decision, even after our faculty had a long meeting with Dean Salamon on April 26, 1993 and directly asked her this question.

We are all the more saddened and confused by this development because of the strong support previously given to our program by you and the two immediate past deans of GSAS as indicated in the report of the Review Committee for the Administrative Sciences Program of August 26, 1991 (see enclosure 3). The report states:

Enclosure 3

ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES PROGRAM
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
2136 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W. • SUITE 301 • WASHINGTON, DC 20052 • (202) 676-8609

> The commitment shown by GSAS has enabled the program to survive and thrive. A transfer to SBPM or SEAS runs the risk that Administrative Sciences will be viewed as a relatively low priority addition whose faculty slots and assets could be better used to enhance other programs. Such an attitude would virtually ensure the program's decline.

Indeed after the Review Committee's report, you stated to GSAS that the matter was "laid to rest until the next self-study review", or not before 1996. On a more positive note, on the basis of the self-study review committee report, you authorized two tenure track faculty positions to enhance faculty recruitment and further strengthen the Administrative Sciences Program.

By your letter of May 29, 1991, you established a committee to investigate the MIS curricula in the various graduate facilities of the University and detailed the circumstances under which significant course duplication could be considered benign (see enclosure 4). You spelled out four conditions that would have to be met. We fully endorsed your criteria and welcomed the investigation, hoping that this "final" review would put the issue of MIS course duplication to rest.

The report of the ad hoc committee of faculty representing the graduate MIS programs in GSAS, SBPM and SEAS was submitted to you on June 2, 1992 (see enclosure 5). The report states:

> All of the programs are stretched to faculty capacity with the three course load, advising and other professional demands.... Students served by the three schools are primarily in different market areas.... The faculty recognizes that there are a few areas of course overlap and duplication, but at most, this amounts to a total of six courses.

Your letter of June 9, 1992 accepts the committee's report as valid (see enclosure 6). You state:

> Seventh, I accept as valid the determination that our differentiated programs are justified because they do have a marketing advantage in that they speak to different potential student constituencies and that they serve those students well by preparing them for employment in differentiated niches in the private and public sectors.

You conclude this letter by stating:

> Lastly, let me take this opportunity to commend the five professors and Dr. Wolfman who produced this splendid piece of work. I trust that they will find it to be an adequate reward that I promise you that the administration will not allow this to become merely another archival document. As you can see from the above, I intend to make your work the basis of significant forward

steps in this field. Thank you all very much for your diligent, intelligent work.

By not consulting us and other relevant faculty about re-opening this issue, we believe that you may not be fully sensing what is going on in the MIS field and are not promoting the adaptive behavior required to cope with change. For example, the Engineering Management Department shared with us some of their thoughts on merging our two programs in a April 19, 1993 memo, although they state that their "preference is that the Administrative Sciences Program remain an independent academic entity" (see enclosure 7).

We sense that the "pressure" to restructure may have had as its origin the launching of our Executive Master in Information Systems Program at the Virginia Campus. It is ironic that we were encouraged by you, the GSAS Dean's council, and the Associate Vice President for External Programs to offer this program at the Virginia Campus and to help insure the success of the Virginia Campus. We seem to be a victim of our responsiveness and of our program's success. The five year-budget projections (FY93-FY97) for EMIS/MIS at the Virginia Campus show margins (revenue - expenses) ranging from $112,572 to $286,530 (see enclosure 8). Anticipated revenues for Administrative Sciences at Crystal City for FY 93 and FY 94 were estimated at over $1,000,000 with projected costs of about $652,000 based 1,000 student enrollments per year (see enclosure 9).

Of continuing concern to us is that three of our faculty (one with tenure and two with five year contracts) are just now completing their first year with us. Even before the end of their first semester, you were considering restructuring this program. We doubt that the decision to join our faculty would have been the same if these faculty members knew what was about to occur. We have been told on a number of separate occasions in recent weeks by you and Dean Salamon that, "no decision has been made", and that if and when a decision for change was reached, it would not be implemented before July 1994. This time table would have provided a reasonable transition period for our faculty and students to adapt. However, we were stunned to learn for the first time from your letter of April 12, 1993 that "management and budgeting control" would begin on July 1, 1993, despite assurances to the contrary. As recently as February 25 and March 10 when two of us met with you individually, you provided assurances that no decision had been made on the issue since you were waiting to obtain the counsel of deans Salamon, Fowler and Frieder, and that if and when a decision was made to transfer Administrative Sciences it would not be enacted before July 1994. We are now concerned about whether we will be able to meet our commitments to our students, and about their reactions to this rapid change.

Employing exactly the same criteria you have stipulated in your letters and conversations over the years, we believe that the decision to move the MIS Program out of Administrative Sciences is in error. We believe Administrative Sciences Program enrollments will be significantly diminished and eventually the entire program will be eroded by division and an attempt to impose Management Sciences Department admission standards, and curricula

requirements. We feel even more strongly that the process by which the decision was reached violates the most fundamental aspects of collegiality and consultation that are so valued in the academic community and at The George Washington University in particular.

We would like at the very least to meet with you to understand why you felt compelled to bring about this change at this time after we have so recently been "validated", i.e. as having a conceptually differentiated program and market; what additional near term changes you are contemplating; and why you so completely excluded us collectively as faculty and as individuals from your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Vincent N. Campbell

Edward J. Cherian

Nancy M. Dixon

Gerard P. Learmonth

Anne W. Martin

William H. Money

Joseph Zeidner

cc: Dean Linda Salamon
Dean David Fowler

enclosures: 9

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: June 9, 1992

To: Deans Burdetsky, Gilmore and Kenny
Deans Designate Fowler, Frieder and Salamon

From: Ro French
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Re: Review of Management Information Systems Curricula

I am taking this means of trying to ensure some continuity of intelligence during this time of transition in the three academic units that offer degrees in this important field. We have the happy and timely circumstance that at this point of transition we have before us a superb report from a committee of faculty consisting of Professors Carson, Cherian, Harrald, Rotenstreich and Winslow and chaired by Associate Vice President Wolfman. This report was done over the course of the last academic year in response to a request from me. It is no exaggeration to say that this report is a model of clarity in its format and of utility in terms of its analysis and identification of areas for future study and administrative action. Rather than attempt to recapitulate all the work that has been done, I have attached copies of my original memorandum and the report prepared by the group just mentioned.

In light of the fact that Dr. Sharon Rogers will be assuming the assignment formerly discharged by Dr. Wolfman, I am asking her to take the initiative in convening a meeting of the three incoming Deans and the appropriate program directors to reflect on the analytical and descriptive portions of the report and to address the topics raised in the concluding section of the document.

Let me simply summarize the principal points in a very brief way and perhaps make a couple of comments about the major headings for future work. There is no reason for any delay in taking up the first assignment which is for Louisa Reynolds to work with the program directors to develop a common recruitment brochure in this increasingly important and increasingly competitive area. Second, I entirely agree with the task force that there ought to be periodic meetings of some small coordinating body of leaders in these several programs. It would be appropriate for Sharon Rogers to serve as the convener for those sessions. Third, I am happy to see that prospective students will be given some text in the 1993-

94 graduate bulletin that provides them with an overview and differentiation of our several related programs. We certainly ought to pursue and indeed reinforce increased course cross listing. Fourth, a major reason for this session that I am asking Sharon to convene involving the three new Deans is to work on the suggestion of our faculty review committee that schools need to revise certain policies in order to facilitate greater cooperation and sharing of instructional resources. Fifth, I believe it ought to be possible to take those steps necessary in order to enable students when desirable to take courses at various locations. Sixth, it goes without saying that a review of resource allocations is central to the task at hand. Seventh, I accept as valid the determination that our differentiated programs are justified because they do have a marketing advantage in that they speak to different potential student constituencies and that they serve those students well by preparing them for employment in differentiated niches in the private and public sectors. Eighth, I think we should act on the preliminary identification of course duplication to eliminate it, and to take whatever steps may be necessary to see that there are more joint appointments when appropriate and far more cross listing of courses when that is the rational thing to do.

Lastly, let me take this opportunity to commend the five professors and Dr. Wolfman who produced this splendid piece of work. I trust that they will find it to be an adequate reward that I promise you that the administration will not allow this to become merely another archival document. As you can see from the above, I intend to make your work the basis of significant forward steps in this field. Thank you all very much for your diligent, intelligent work.

RSF/crm
Attachments
cc: Professors Carson, Cherian, Harrald, Rotenstreich and Winslow
Associate Vice President Wolfman
President Trachtenberg

TO: Executive Committee of the George Washington University Faculty Senate

FROM: The Adjunct Faculty for the Administrative Sciences Program

DATE: May 18, 1993

We, the undersigned members of the Administrative Sciences adjunct faculty, are deeply disturbed by the actions that recently have been taken to dismember the Administrative Sciences Program at the George Washington University. We urge the University, for the good of the students in this program, as well as future students, to reverse the decision and to maintain the full integrity of the Administrative Sciences Program.

We ask you to put the interests of the students in the Administrative Sciences Program first. There is a very clear reason why the Administrative Sciences Program is in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The Administrative Sciences Program is neither a trade school nor a technical training program. It was never designed to be another business school program. Instead, the Administrative Sciences Program is designed to educate liberal arts students and others--many of whom have been out in the world of work for a number of years--and help them to become successful and broad-minded managers through an innovative interdisciplinary curriculum.

It could be argued that we, the Administrative Sciences adjunct faculty, have a vested interest in keeping the program intact. However, the remuneration that we receive for being adjunct faculty is so small that one cannot seriously consider that financial motives are leading us to write this letter. Also, many of us have, over the years, been approached by other local universities to teach in their programs at higher pay rates, but we have decided to remain with the George Washington University's Administrative Sciences Program. While we are adjunct faculty, many of us have been with this program for quite a long time. We have continued in this program because we believe in the goals and values of the Administrative Sciences curriculum.

Many of us are also employers of George Washington University graduates. We often find that candidates for positions in our organizations know the technical side of business (e.g., present discounted value, computer sciences, information technology, etc.), but they do not know how to deal with more important "vision" and "value" issues. While the Administrative Sciences Program does teach such concepts as present discounted value, management information systems, and various parts of information technology, the main goal is to produce a broad-minded and well-rounded manager and/or administrator who can deal with decision making in complex organizational settings. The philosophy of this interdisciplinary program is very different from other parts of the University that deal with Management Information Systems (MIS).

The Administrative Sciences Program offers a course of study "...that is significantly different from analogous offerings in other schools. It fills a niche by serving students without a math/engineering or a programming background and by emphasizing organizational behavior, drawing from psychology and

economics, as well as statistics, management, and engineering. We thus believe that it addresses a need not fully met by other programs and Departments at the University and within the Washington area." (Report of the Review Committee for the Administrative Sciences Program dated August 26, 1991.)

In our view, all three graduate MIS programs the university offers are important, and any action that would deemphasize one relative to the other two weakens the University's ability to profess knowledge. The field is complex enough that diversity in program perspective is critical to ensure that we are describing the entire elephant, not just a leg here and a trunk there.

Previous discussions have approached this issue from the standpoint of the fit of MIS into the Administrative Sciences Program. One of the strengths of the Administrative Sciences Program is the juxtaposition of Human Resources Management (HRM), Organizational Management (OM) and MIS.

Traditional *personnel management* programs deal with operational issues--the practice areas of HRM (selection, training, appraisal, etc.). By incorporating HR information systems into personnelists' thinking, we help personnelists make the conceptual breakthrough to strategic thinking. Graduates of the Administrative Sciences HRM track are better positioned to become full business partners--with an understanding of the value of strategic planning, tools to help them analyze issues and make better decisions, and a strong background in the human issues surrounding the use of technology, and facilitating change--the *sine qua non* of continuous improvement. By having an MIS and HRM track in the same program, with core courses for both tracks, we bring an analytic view to the HRM arena that is sorely lacking. This cross-pollination yields MIS graduates with a strong understanding of human issues, and an HRM graduate with an appreciation for the value of information and analysis.

We believe that the decision to take the MIS portion away from the Administrative Sciences Program would have a very demoralizing effect on the students in the Administrative Sciences Program and would jeopardize the continued success of the remaining HRM and OM tracks. The program is highly successful in terms of students (both quantity and quality), and the program is highly successful in terms of finances. We believe that the Administrative Sciences Program plays a very vital and unique role in the George Washington University and serves a community need not addressed by the School of Business and Public Management.

It is ironic that the Administrative Sciences Program--which teaches such concepts as total quality management, group decision making, worker participation, team approaches, etc., is being hurt by "nineteenth century management" approaches at their worst. In recent years, the Administrative Sciences Program has undergone several open and above-board reviews. As we understand it, the Administrative Sciences Program has passed each one of these reviews. However, the current decision was not open and above-board; rather it was done in secret. Only after the decision was a done deal was the Administrative Sciences Program told what had been decided. Neither the Administrative Sciences full-time faculty, nor its adjunct faculty, were ever informed of what was going on. We were never allowed to give our inputs before this decision was made.

Also, it would be one thing if the entire Administrative Sciences Program was being terminated for academic or financial reasons. But this is not what is

being contemplated. Instead, other parts of the University have targeted the most financially successful parts of the Administrative Sciences Program (i.e., the MIS track) and have left the smaller parts to struggle on their own. Please understand that this is a highly integrated, interdisciplinary program of faculty, courses, computer lab, comprehensive examinations, and marketing efforts.

We thank you in advance for considering our views before a decision is made in this area. If it would be helpful for you to meet with the adjunct faculty of the Administrative Sciences Program, or several representatives from the adjunct faculty, we would be delighted to meet with you and help you in any way possible. You may contact Dr. Richard S. Belous at (202) 265-7685 (w), (703) 938-2052 (h), and (202) 797-5516 (FAX).

We firmly believe that the best decision for the students in the Administrative Sciences Program is to maintain the full integrity of the Administrative Sciences Program. We believe that this can only be done if the plan to dismember the Administrative Sciences Program is not implemented.

Sincerely,

Thomas Buckholtz	Richard Belous	Wayne Camara	Barbara Cerny
Henry Eskew	Jerry Georgatos	Steven Kimmel	Bruce Kutnick
Jon Morris	Thomas Richards	Markley Roberts	Theodore Rosen
Robert Sadacca	Marshall Sashkin	James Sharf	Lucretia Tanner
Stephen Versace	Stephen Wehrenberg	Peter Weiss	

cc: President Trachtenberg
Vice-President French
Dean Salamon, CCGSAS
Dean Fowler, SBPM
Dean Frieder, SEAS

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC
VIRGINIA CAMPUS

ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES PROGRAM

July 2, 1993

Dr. Roderick S. French
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dear Dr. French:

Professor Zeidner has shared with us, the members of the Administrative Sciences Program, the content of your letter to him dated June 29, 1993. This letter to you is of a personal nature and should not be construed in any way as a divergence from my standing with my colleagues in our joint pursuit of an equitable resolution in the matter of the impending dissolution of the Administrative Sciences Program.

As you know, on July 1, 1992, I began a five-year, non-tenure accruing appointment as Academic Director of the Administrative Sciences Program, Virginia Campus and Associate Professor of Administrative Sciences. In considering acceptance of this appointment, I gave particularly high import to the prospect that the Administrative Sciences Program would, in fact, continue operation for at least the coincident five-year period. I was given such assurances by everyone whom I asked. My concern stemmed from having already gone through a difficult program termination at Dartmouth College.

Had I known, or even thought for one moment, that the Administrative Sciences Program was to be dissolved within the year, I most certainly would not have accepted this appointment. Even had I been informed that there was a plan to move the Management Information Systems tracks of Administrative Sciences into the Management Science Department, I still would not have accepted the appointment because of the uncertainty surrounding such an action and the fact that there are fundamental differences between our two approaches to this field of study.

On April 15th of this year, the members of the faculty of the Administrative Sciences Program were told for the first time officially that the MIS tracks were to be moved to the Management Science Department and that I and two colleagues were to be similarly transferred without prior consent. I know of no precedent where a faculty member has been transferred unilaterally from one department to another much less from one school to another without prior consultation and informed consent. There are no financial or other exigencies that could possibly justify such action in this case.

20101 ACADEMIC WAY • SUITE 321 • ASHBURN VIRGINIA 22011-2004

In spite of all this, I am in receipt of a letter from you dated May 14, 1993 whereby you inform me of my "reappointment as Academic Director of the Administrative Sciences Program, Virginia Campus, and Associate Professor of Administrative Sciences" and that this is "for the second year of a contractual period of five years." I do not view this contract as a personal services contract where I can be treated as so much chattel to be bartered and sold. By announcing on April 15th that I am to be "traded" and then reappointing me to my original position within the month, I believe that this must be your view.

I would ask that you:

a) share with me your general views on this matter of the transfer of my appointment to the School of Business and Public Management;
b) cite if you will any precedents of such unilateral action;
c) explain why the Faculty Code provisions requiring consultation (Article IX) apparently do not apply here; and
d) explain why such a transfer does not constitute a "Termination of Non-Tenured Appointments" (Article V, Section B.) requiring proper notification; and
e) whether or not the appropriate faculty, department chair, and dean of the School of Business and Public Management have taken any action to offer me an equivalent appointment.

Sincerely,

Gerard P. Learmonth Sr.

Gerard P. Learmonth Sr.

cc: Professor Joseph Zeidner

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC
VIRGINIA CAMPUS

EXECUTIVE MASTER IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROGRAM

July 6, 1993

Dr. Roderick French
Vice President For Academic Affairs
The George Washington University

Dear Dr. French:

I have carefully read your letter which states that the Administrative Sciences Program will be transferred to the School of Business and Public Administration.

I have determined that I no longer wish to pursue the protest which has been lodged by the Administrative Sciences faculty against this organizational change. Therefore, I have withdrawn from the Administrative Sciences Program grievance previously presented to the Executive Committee of the University Senate.

It is important to me that you understand my thoughts regarding your decision. I believe the members of the Administrative Sciences faculty have a legitimate complaint that has significant merit behind it. Quite simply, I personally believe that one should plan, orchestrate, and implement major program reorganizations with the full involvement of the affected faculty. All current management thinking, and even the University policies seem to indicate that such discussions are both wise and prudent. Despite the account in your letter, and Dean Salmon's interesting list of meetings and discussions, this has simply not occurred.

My first reason for declining to pursue this complaint is that I simply wish to stop this overt and draining conflict. Our university might be better served if the merits and methods of implementing the intended changes were discussed. In a university environment the dialogue by concerned parties on all sides of this issue should lead to an overall strengthening of the programs and schools involved.

Instead of leading a productive exchange on this issue, you have inflamed the situation because you appear to be unaware of the impacts of your decision or the methods used to communicate that decision. In addition, Dean Salamon's actions and your leadership on this issue appear to ignore the current reality and implementation problems from the Administrative Sciences faculty and administrative perspectives. It is unclear to me why you would wish to further inflame the perception of this being "done without

20101 ACADEMIC WAY, ASHBURN VIRGINIA 22011-2604
METRO (703) 478-8980 • LOCAL (703)729-8330 • FAX (703)729-8311

consultation", but your recent letter does just that. The letter alludes to an unseen implementation plan that now seems to have been prepared by someone who is not involved in teaching the courses in this program or working with the students entering the program. There is nothing you could have said in your letter to aggravate the faculty more than to imply that you don't care about the faculty's fully accurate complaint that they weren't involved in this decision, and should be involved in any future changes or plans to make the change work. Your letter implies that you have generated a plan without the discussions you promised would take place in our meeting of June 9, 1993.

My second reason is that I believe the Administrative Sciences program has been significantly harmed by the six months of questions and rumors regarding this impending change. It is critical for the University that we continue building a program with vision, one which understands and address the needs of the students in our market. We must develop clear research programs to attract additional support and faculty. This is clearly not happening under the present circumstances. I believe we need a new supportive Administrative Sciences home, so we can pursue these or other critical objectives and goals.

I hope this issue will be resolved when the faculty returns to campus and the new school year begins in September. I am looking forward to a fall that will not be focused on this highly political and controversial topic. Hopefully we will in the future be able to clearly view the important characteristics of the complex structure within which we operate and master the ability to work within and possibly change these structures in a more effective fashion.

Thank you for your time and attention on this issue.

Sincerely,

William H. Money

William H. Money
Associate Professor

cc: Professor Lilian F. Robinson
Dean Linda B. Salamon

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor John H. Carson, Chair of Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid 994-8246]

A RESOLUTION TO CHANGE THE NAME AND SCOPE OF THE STANDING SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS POLICY AND STUDENT FINANCIAL AID (93/7)

WHEREAS, the overall concern of an admissions policy and financial aid policy is to support the University in meeting its enrollment goals; and

WHEREAS, admissions policy, student financial aid, and enrollment are clearly interralated and the University itself has consolidated these activities under the title of Enrollment Management; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That the mission of the Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid Senate Standing committee be extended to examine issues of enrollment and enrollment management; and

(2) That the committee's name be changed to the "Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management."

Committee on Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid
March 24, 1994

Adopted April 8, 1994

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Ernest J. Englander, Chair of Physical Facilities 994-8203]

A RESOLUTION ON THE FACULTY SENATE'S SUPPORT FOR THE GWU GREEN MODEL UNIVERSITY TASK FORCE (93/8)

WHEREAS, a number of interested faculty, students, staff, and administrators from across the University have voluntarily formed a Green Model University Task Force; and

WHEREAS, this Task Force is exploring options for increasing the University's environmental sensitivity in the areas of teaching, research, campus infrastructure, and community relationships; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force is committed to supporting options which when further developed and implemented will at least be cumulatively "budget-neutral;" NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate declares its support for the efforts and activities of the Green Model University Task Force and encourages the Task Force to provide information to the Faculty Senate on its plans and progress.

Committee on Physical Facilities
March 4, 1994

Adopted April 8, 1994

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate 994-7094]

A RESOLUTION ON THE PROCESS OF HANDLING ADMINISTRATIVE NONCONCURRENCES WITH FACULTY PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

(93/9)

WHEREAS, on February 10, 1994 the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University requested that the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President of the University and the Faculty Senate develop an appropriate process for handling administrative nonconcurrences removing the trustees from participation in the nonconcurrences process;

WHEREAS, a joint committee composed of representatives of the faculty and of the administration has labored to arrive at a compromise solution, with final decisional authority to be vested in a body with representation of both faculty and administration;

~~**WHEREAS**, on April 7, 1994 the President indicated to the joint committee that a solution which did not vest decisional authority in the President may be unacceptable; and~~

WHEREAS, the expressed consensus of the Faculty Senate at its March 25, 1994 meeting was that the process for handling administrative nonconcurrences be concluded with an independent and binding post-administration review;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That it reconfirms that any review process for handling administrative nonconcurrences shall be a post-administration review and shall be final; and

That negotiations continue with the aim of arriving at a mutually acceptable compromise by all parties consistent with this resolution.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
April 8, 1994

Adopted, as amended, April 8, 1994

This document referred to in Res. 93/9 but not adopted -- negotiations were to continue to arrive at a process for administrative nonconcurrences acceptable to all parties.

4/5/94

Draft produced by the Ad Hoc Committee of Faculty and Administrators (Professors Robinson, Johnston, Holmes, Cohn, Henig, Vice President French, Deans Friedenthal and Salamon) with modifications by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

New paragraph B.3 for Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code

3. Appointments and actions affecting renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure designation, and termination of service shall normally follow faculty recommendations. Departures from this standard shall be limited to those cases involving compelling reasons. Nonconcurring recommendations from a Dean accompanied by compelling reasons and documentation shall be sent by the Dean to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate through the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Executive Committee may seek additional information and advice and shall make recommendations to the department or program that originated the recommendation and to the Dean. If concurrence cannot be obtained after both parties have had opportunity for reconsideration in the light of the recommendations of the Executive Committee, the recommendation of the Dean, accompanied by the recommendation of the faculty and the report of the Executive Committee of its deliberations and recommendation shall be transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review all pertinent materials related to faculty personnel recommendations and make a decision which is then transmitted to the appropriate parties.

If the decision of the Vice President is appealed by either the originating unit or a Dean, the President shall invoke the formation of a University Review Committee. The Review Committee will consist of five members. Two members will be selected by the University President, at least one of whom must be selected from a Faculty Panel elected by the faculties of the Schools as specified below. The University President may appoint one academic administrator who is not a member of the Faculty Panel as long as he or she possesses academic and professional qualifications that would warrant tenure in an appropriate unit of the University. Any such administrative appointee shall not be directly associated with the School in which the nonconcurrence has arisen. If the President appoints from outside the University, the Senate Executive Committee may then select a faculty member from outside the University; otherwise, the three members will be selected by the Senate Executive Committee from the Faculty Panel. Those appointees designated from the Faculty Panel, whether chosen by the President

or by the Senate Executive Committee, shall not be members of the department making the original recommendation.

The Faculty Panel consisting of fifteen tenured full Professors shall be elected to staggered three-year terms. Three members each shall be elected by the Medical School and Columbian College; two members each shall be elected by the Schools of Business and Public Management, Engineering and Applied Science, Education and Human Development, and the National Law Center; one member shall be elected by the Elliott School of International Affairs. All regular, active-status, full-time faculty members shall be eligible to vote in these elections.

The Review Committee shall make its determination on the basis of the documents presented to it by the Department or other unit that made the initial recommendation, by the school, by the nonconcurring administrator and by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Review Committee may also seek additional information or presentations from the candidate or the recognized parties to the dispute.

The **only** standard for review shall be whether compelling reasons exist for the nonconcurrence with the recommendation of the initiating faculty unit.

The Review Committee shall render a decision by secret ballot no later than 60 days from the date it first receives the case unless the recognized parties agree to an extension. No extension shall exceed 60 days. The decision shall be by a simple majority vote.

The University Review Committee shall advise the President of its decision. If the University Review Committee sustains the Vice President's nonconcurrence, the denial of the recommendation shall be reported to the President. If the University Review Committee determines there are no compelling reasons to overturn the originating unit's recommendation, then its decision shall be transmitted by the President to the Board of Trustees for approval, except in cases of extraordinary financial exigency or termination of an academic program, as defined in Section V.C.2.3. of the 1986 Edition of the Faculty Code, as amended.

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (93/10)

WHEREAS, Victor H. Cohn will retire in June after 33 years of service to the Medical School and to the University; and

WHEREAS, Victor H. Cohn will be leaving his position as a member of the Faculty Senate due to his retirement as an active faculty member; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the following citation be issued:

In recognition of 33 years of active faculty service to The George Washington University and its School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and in recognition of his scientific contributions to this field; and

In recognition of his teaching of students and graduate students and his support of student rights and responsibilities; and

In recognition of his continuing strong vocal support of faculty rights, marked by his membership on the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee for 10 years and its Chair for 2 years, and by his membership on the Dispute Resolution Committee for 8 years and its Chair for 3 years; and

In recognition of his membership in the Medical School Faculty Senate for many years and his membership in the University Faculty Senate from 1978-80, 1987-89, and 1992-94; NOW THEREFORE

THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

CITES

PROFESSOR VICTOR H. COHN

FOR

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg
President

Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Executive Committee

April 8, 1994

Adopted by acclamation 4/8/94